

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached eight (8) sheets of formal drawings replace the original eight (8) sheets of informal drawings.

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG.7. This sheet, which includes FIG.7, replaces the original sheet including FIG.7. FIG. 7 has been amended by deleting the duplicate word “of” from boxes 240 and 250 in FIG.7.

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG.10. This sheet, which includes FIG.10, replaces the original sheet including FIG.10. FIG. 10 has been amended by adding the label “NO” to the arrow from box 404 to box 406 in FIG.10.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-32, 34- 40 are in the case. The applicant has studied the Office Action dated April 18, 2006 and has made the changes believed appropriate to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 6-13, 17-24, 28-33, 36-37, 40 and 41 have been rejected as anticipated by Griffin et al. (U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2002/0161869, hereinafter “Griffin”). Claims 2-5, 13-16, 24-27 and 37-39 have been rejected as unpatentable over Griffin in view of Georgious et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,003,597, hereinafter “Georgious”). Claim 34 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Griffin in view of Ikeda (U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2004/0076163). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a method comprising “designating a first portion of a virtual memory space as an unreserved portion which is conditionally accessible by a class of memory users which includes at least one memory user wherein said unreserved portion is mapped to physical memory space; designating a second portion of said virtual memory space as a reserved portion which is conditionally unavailable for use by any memory user of said class of memory users wherein none of said reserved portion is mapped to physical memory space; and converting a subportion of one of said unreserved portion and said reserved portion to a subportion of the other of said unreserved portion and said reserved portion.” The Examiner has cited a method of the Griffin reference which describes moving the boundary between partitions of a virtual address space to allocate additional virtual address space to a partition. Griffin, ¶80. However, the Examiner has cited no portion of the Griffin reference which teaches that “none of said reserved portion is mapped to physical memory space” as required by claim 1. On the contrary, it is the Examiner’s position that the address portion of the Griffin method which corresponds to the recited “reserved” portion is that portion of the address space utilized by objects. It does not appear that the “reserved” portion could be utilized by objects if none of the reserved portion is mapped to physical memory space.

The deficiencies of the Griffin reference are not met by the Examiner's citations to the Georgious or Ikeda reference.

Independent claims 12, 23 and 36 may be distinguished in a similar fashion. The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the anticipation or obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner's comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-19 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 18, 2006

By: William K. Konrad/

William K. Konrad

Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984